



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,640	01/25/2002	Richard A. Gunderson	737.008US1	9838

7590 07/08/2003

Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

GOINS, DAVETTA WOODS

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/056,640	GUNDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Davetta W. Goins	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 13-15-19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 43, 44, 47, 48, 67, 68, 71, 72, 74, 79, 80, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams (US Pat. 5,528,217).

In reference to claims 1, 22, 43, 48, 67, 68, 71, 74, 79, 70, 82, Adams discloses a) the claimed a sensor control unit having at least one sensor coupled thereto, the sensor control unit capable of determining an object within a predetermined field of view for each sensor coupled thereto, and within a predetermined detection range, which is met by distance ranging circuit 46 (col. 4, lines

Art Unit: 2632

63-67), b) the claimed driver vehicle interface coupled to the sensor control unit, the driver vehicle interface configured to receive signals from the sensor control unit representative of objects determined by the sensor control unit, which is met by warning system 26 (col. 4, lines 35-52), and c) the claimed display unit coupled to the driver vehicle interface capable of providing a visual representation of objects determined by the sensor control unit, wherein the trailer based collision warning system is adapted for mounting to a trailer, which is met by visual displays including a numeric display 88 and multi-color display 42 as well as providing audio sound or audio messages (col. 4, lines 35-52).

In reference to claims 2, 23, 44, Adams discloses the claimed predetermined detection range is programmable for each sensor, which is met by a microprocessor 89 allowing the distance ranges to be adjusted such that the sensors are actuated in different distance ranges (col. 6, lines 1-17).

In reference to claims 3, 27, 28, 30, 72, Adams discloses the claimed based collision warning system receives power and signals from a cable coupled to a trailer for providing power and signals when the trailer is coupled to a tractor, which is met by wiring conductors available from the various receptacle connections of the vehicles such as a tractor trailer arrangement; a battery 16 grounded by connection 17 to the chassis for the vehicle (col. 4, lines 45-58).

In reference to claim 5, Adams discloses the claimed control unit is capable of controlling a plurality of individual sensors including one or more types of sensors, which is met by a plurality of ultrasonic acoustical transducer/receiver devices 22 (col. 4, lines 11-34).

In reference to claims 8, 26, 47, Adams discloses the claimed interface unit includes a processor and memory for directing the sensor control unit receiving information from the sensor control units, and transferring detection information to the display unit, which is met by microprocessor 89 (col. 6, lines 1-17).

In reference to claims 13-15, 17-19, Adams discloses the claimed plurality of lights, a housing containing the plurality of lights for providing weather protection and mounting to a trailer; and a signals interface coupled to the plurality of lights for receiving signals to activate the individual lights of the plurality of lights, wherein the plurality of lights are configured to provide detection information and status information when activated, which is met by a numerical display 88 and multi-color display 42 including a plurality of light-emitting diodes (LED) to represent the area in which the detectors 22 have determined an object to be located within the preselected distance range (col. 5, lines 56-64).

In reference to claim 16, Adams discloses the claimed signals interface comprising individual signal conducting lines coupled to the individual lights of the plurality of lights, which is met by the wiring conductors available from the various receptacle connections (col. 4, lines 35-52).

3. Claims 39-41, 69, 73, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paranjpe (US Pat. 6,339,369 B1).

In reference to claim 39, 69, 73, Paranjpe discloses the claimed information display to communicate warning information to a driver of a vehicle; and an adaptor capable of being coupled to an auxiliary power outlet of the vehicle, wherein the adaptor includes a power line carrier interface circuit for receiving collision warning information superimposed on a vehicle battery power wiring, the collision warning information being communicated to the driver by the information display, which is met by a plurality of remote units 4 mounted along the side of a vehicle; the remote units 4 used to detect an object within a certain distance; a warning indicator module 50 communicates wirelessly with the remote units 4. Power source 21 for the system can comprise of a battery 22, solar cell 23, or an external power jack 24 (col. 5, lines 34-54).

In reference to claims 40, 41, Pranje discloses the claimed information display includes a speaker for providing information audibly, which is met by warning indicator module 50 communicating with the operator through audio and visual means (col. 5, lines 26-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 6, 7, 29, 75-78, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Kam (US Pat. 6,225,918 B1).

In reference to claims 4, 6, 29, 75-78, Adams does not disclose the claimed display unit includes a set of lights capable of being mounted on a right side of a trailer, and another set of lights capable of being mounted on a left side of the trailer, both sets of lights viewable by a driver of a tractor in the tractor side view mirrors. Kam discloses a detector means 45, radar, ultrasonic waves, etc., or a spaced plurality of detector means 45 that may be placed along a vehicle 19, which can be a trailer (col. 4, line 49-61; col. 6, lines 19-45). Upon the detector means 45 detecting an object within a target area 17, the brake lights 29, 31, and 33 are illuminated (col. 5, lines 20-45). Since Adams discloses warning displays located in the cab of the trailer to indicate to the driver of detected objects, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of lights mounted on any side of the trailer, such as the warning indicators disclosed by Kam, with the system of Adams, to ensure that the driver is capable of determining which side of the vehicle the object has been detected.

In reference to claim 7, although Adams does not disclose the claimed first sensor control unit controlling a plurality of radar sensors, a second sensor control unit controlling a plurality of radar sensors, a third sensor control unit, controlling two ultrasonic sensors and a radar sensor, wherein the sensors of the third sensor control unit are capable of being rear mounted to a trailer, the sensors of the first sensor control unit are adapted to mounting to a right side of the trailer, the sensors of the second sensor control unit are adapted to mounted to a left side of the trailer, he does disclose a microprocessor 89 allowing the distance ranges to be adjusted such that the sensors are actuated in different distance ranges (col. 6, lines 1-17). Kam discloses a detector means 45, radar, ultrasonic waves, etc., or a spaced plurality of detector means 45 that may be

placed along a vehicle 19, which can be a trailer (col. 4, line 49-61; col. 6, lines 19-45). Since Adams discloses a plurality a plurality of ultrasonic acoustical transducer/receiver devices 22 along the trailer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of using any type of proximity sensing means that are well known in the art such as radar, as disclosed by Kam, or any number of other distance detectors to ensure that the trailer indication is capable of detecting and displaying any detected object to the driver.

6. Claims 9, 12, 24, 25, 45, 46, 70, 81, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Smithline (US Pat. 5,734,336).

In reference to claims 9, 12, 24, 25, 45, 46, 70, 81, Adams does not disclose the claimed vehicle interface and the sensor control unit perform a built-in test function each time power is applied to the trailer based collision warning system and continue to perform built-in test functions while the trailer based collision warning system is in operation, and wherein a malfunction in the trailer based collision warning system is reported by the driver vehicle interface through the display unit. Smithline discloses a collision avoidance system including a plurality of ultrasonic acoustic transducers and receiving means to detect the range of objects, displays mounted on the vehicle mirrors 110, 120a microprocessor programmed to continuously perform diagnostic tests of the system (col. 3, lines 6-10; col. 4, lines 10-63). Since both Adams and Smithline disclose programmable microprocessors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching to perform test functions, as disclosed by

Smithline, with the system of Adams, to ensure that the system will notify the driver upon detection of a malfunction while detecting the proximity around the trailer.

7. Claims 10, 11, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Markus (US Pat. 6,421,081 B1).

In reference to claims 10, 11, 83, Adams does not disclose the claimed system includes multiple video cameras connected to a video switch, which is controlled by the driver vehicle interface. Markus discloses a vehicle including a plurality of buttons 57 positioned for controlling the movement of camera 12; a video screen 32 is mounted on the dashboard to allow the driver to view what's captured by the video camera 12 (col. 7, lines 33-65). Since Adams discloses a system comprising a plurality of ultrasonic devices surrounding the trailer for detecting the proximity of nearby objects, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of including a video switch, camera, and display means, as disclosed by Markus, to allow the driver the capability of viewing the actual object that has been detected.

8. Claims 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams.

In reference to claims 20, 21, although Adams does not specifically disclose the claimed plurality of lights including four LEDs proving seven ranges of distance information, he does disclose that the LED indicators can give an indication once an object is detected between 10 to 15 feet, 0 to 5

feet, or 5 to 10 feet (col. 5, lines 65-67; col. 6, lines 1-17). A microprocessor 89 can be adjusted to select any ranges desired (col. 6, lines 12-16). Since Adams discloses a programmable microprocessor to select any desired range of distance, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include seven ranges or any number of ranges by the driver to allow the driver the capability of determining at what distance the trailer is near an object before he's warned.

9. Claims 31-38, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Paranjpe (US Pat. 6,339,369 B1).

In reference to claims 31-37, Adams does not disclose the claimed audio unit including a first wireless data transceiver coupled to the driver vehicle interface for receiving information from the sensor control units, the first wireless data transceiver capable of transmitting the received information. Paranjpe discloses a plurality of remote units 4 mounted along the side of a vehicle; the remote units 4 used to detect an object within a certain distance; a warning indicator module 50 communicates wirelessly with the remote units 4. Power source 21 for the system can comprise of a battery 22, solar cell 23, or an external power jack 24 (col. 5, lines 34-54). Since both Adams and Paranjpe disclose an object detection device for a vehicle, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of using wireless data transceivers coupled to the driver vehicle interface, as disclosed by Paranjpe, with the system of Adams, to allow the transceiving units to be placed at any location wanted by the driver.

In reference to claim 38, Adams discloses the claimed speaker audibly provides information indicating status conditions, right side indication, left side indication, rear indication, and ranging information, which is met by a numeric display 88 and multi-color display 42 as well as providing audio sound or audio messages (col. 4, lines 35-52).

10. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paranjpe in view of Adams.

In reference to claim 42, although Paranjpe does not specifically disclose the claimed speaker audibly provides information indicating status conditions, right side indication, left side indication, rear indication, and ranging information, he does disclose a warning indicator module 50 communicating with the operator through audio and visual means (col. 5, lines 26-33). Adams discloses visual displays including a numeric display 88 and multi-color display 42 as well as providing audio sound or audio messages (col. 4, lines 35-52). Since both Paranjpe and Adams disclose vehicle systems for monitoring it's surroundings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of providing an audible signal with the location of the detected object, as disclosed by Adams, with the system of Paranjpe, to allow the driver to be audibly notified of the detected object without having to be visually distracted by looking at a display.

11. Claims 49-57, 69, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Coulthard (US Pat. 5,825,286).

In reference to claims 49-56, 69, Adams does not disclose the claimed direction of motion sensor to provide direction information to the sensor control units or the driver vehicle interface.

Coulthard discloses a vehicle monitoring system including an acceleration sensor and vibration sensor 280 for detecting the change of movement in any direction (col. 12, lines 16-31). Since both Paranjpe and Coulthard disclose vehicle systems for monitoring it's surroundings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of an acceleration sensor for detecting motion, as disclosed by Coulthard, with the system of Adams, to ensure that the drive is capable of determining the rate at which an object is traveling in relation to the trailer.

In reference to claim 57, although Adams does not specifically disclose the claimed predetermined period of time stored before a collision is about four minutes, he does disclose a programmable microprocessor 89 (col. 6, lines 1-17). Since Adams discloses a programmable microprocessor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a time period before which the driver would like to be notified to prevent any false warnings.

12. Claims 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Coulthard as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Adams in view of Paranjpe.

In reference to claims 58-60, 62 Adams does not disclose the claimed wireless communication. Paranjpe discloses a plurality of remote units 4 mounted along the side of a vehicle; the remote units 4 used to detect an object within a certain distance; a warning indicator module 50 communicates wirelessly with the remote units 4. Power source 21 for the system can comprise of a battery 22, solar cell 23, or an external power jack 24 (col. 5, lines 34-54). Since both Adams and Paranjpe disclose an object detection device for a vehicle, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of using wireless data transceivers coupled to the driver vehicle interface, as disclosed by Paranjpe, with the system of Adams, to allow the transceiving units to be placed at any location wanted by the driver.

In reference to claim 61, although Adams does not disclose the claimed information is stored in the memory of the driver vehicle interface in a black box recorder coupled to the driver vehicle interface, he does disclose a programmable microprocessor 89 (col. 6, lines 1-17). Since Adams discloses a programmable microprocessor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store information in a black box coupled to the vehicle interface to allow collision data to be retrieved at a later date.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davetta W. Goins whose telephone number is 703-306-2761. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri with every other Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on 703-308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-7666.

Davetta W. Goins
Art Unit 2632



D.W.G.
June 30, 2003